

Submitter	Submission #	Activity	Marked Up	Change YES/NO	Reasoning	New change	Section Reference	Commenting on	Proposed Amendment	Reasoning
Remarkables Park	1a	Landscape	n/a	Refer 2b in 'September 2017' tab No Change	Maintaining gardens in residential streets is not the level of service council provides. License To Occupy may be sought for developers who wish to deliver a higher level of service	n/a	7.2.3	The restriction of gardens being established in residential road reserves.	Delete this restriction	Objective 27.2.1 of the Proposed QLDC District Plan states – Subdivision will create quality environments that ensure the District is a desirable place to live, visit, work and play. A streetscape restricted to road, grass berms, street trees and a footpath does not promote this outcome. The restriction of garden beds within residential subdivisions does not align with this objective of the District Plan. Remarkables Park has a number of examples where planting within the streetscape has created a sustainable, high quality and vibrant community. Therefore RPL & SPL considers flexibility should be provided as anticipated by the objectives of the code to allow streetscape design to response to the particular context of the subdivision.
Remarkables Park	1b	Roading	n/a	Refer 2c in 'September 2017' tab No Change	CoP may be amended if required in the future to align with District Plan Chapter when adopted, and deviations may be applied for and allowed if considered appropriate	n/a	3.3.6 & C3.3.6	On street Parking Requirement	Delete specification of on street parking numbers and defer to the District Plan and resource consent process to guide street design and parking requirements.	RPL & QPL consider a requirement of 1 on street parking space per residential unit in a Low Density environment is excessive and would not necessarily be achievable taking into account driveways, swales and street trees. Furthermore, RPL & SPL consider flexibility should be provided to enable assessment of on street parking requirements on a case by case basis so for example, proximity to other parking facilities can be taken into account. In addition, given the Council has recently notified Chapter 29 Transport District Wide (PDP Stage 2) of the District Plan which in terms of parking numbers seeks to set a policy direct to reduce provision of parking. It is considered the proposed code of practise and this Section is in contradiction to this policy direction. Because these two process are taking place in parallel although impacting the same issues it also highlights the necessity for these two component to be brought together to ensure consistency in approach. The resource consent process and RMA provides a robust process and framework for assessment and therefore it is unnecessary and inefficient to try replicate this process through a code of practise.
Remarkables Park	1c	Landscape	n/a	Refer 2d in 'September 2017' tab No Change	Rather than having an 8m3 tree pit dug it was intended that the tree would have access to at least 8m3 of soil. This means the actual pit could be far less i.e. 2 – 3m3 provided there was more soil around the pit (i.e. not rock, gravels etc.).	n/a	Appendix I – Street Tree Planting Guidelines	Where practicable, the rooting environment shall be manipulated to provide no less than 8 cubic meters of unpacked soil	Change to 1.5 cubic meters	8 cubic metres far exceeds the necessary level of unpacked soil to successfully establish a tree. Taking into account other requirements of the streetscape design including swale width, indented parking dimension RPL & SPL consider it would be difficult and in a umber of situations impossible to achieve this requirement. In RPL & QPL's experience street trees have successfully established in significantly less space. Therefore, we do not consider this requirement is justified or necessary.
Remarkables Park	1d	Network Utility Services	n/a	nb. This is an amendment from 2015 No change.	Council understands the issues and are amending standard conditions of resource consent accordingly.	n/a	8.4.7	Completion of Work	Add the bold words to the end of the following sentence: Following completion of the works and prior to issuing a 224(c) certificate the developer shall provide written confirmation from the Network Utility Service providers that the installation has been completed to their standards and that they are satisfied with access provisions allowing for maintenance and future upgrading of their network. In the case of a blown fibre network the required installation shall be Chorus approved ducting to the boundary of any new saleable lot.	Confusion has occurred in some instances where final sign off from Chorus has been withheld until fibre has been blown through the duct and into premises within the site and the issue of a Section 224(c) certificate has been unnecessarily delayed. Therefore adding the words as suggested above will more accurately reflect the anticipated service requirement whilst avoiding the delays that have occurred in the past.
Stantec	2a	General	n/a	No Change	Clear definition of design standards in CoP and reference to NZ standards. No further need for additional infrastructure code In terms of the designs taking precedence over the CoP requirements this is allowed for through accepted deviations through he engineering acceptance process.	n/a	1, 1.1, 1.3	Purpose of the Code of Practice	Clarification on the document either being, or not being, a detailed specification for construction work and clarity on cross over with the QLDC district plan	The original NZS 4404 has been produced as a standard and as stated in the scope, Section 1 concerns general matters to be observed but Section 2 provides 'good practice guidelines'. With some of the changes included in the COP and particularly some added by QLDC around standard details it appears that QLDC are intending to use the document both as a design standard (which is appropriate) and a specification (which in a lot of cases is not appropriate as there is not detailed specification requirements included in the COP). An example being footpaths. The COP covers their design requirements and includes a typical detail which generally shows the make up of their construction but it does not state standard specification requirements such as what testing is required on the basecourse prior to surfacing, what surface finish is required prior to surfacing, what tolerances on finished surface level are acceptable? It also refers to basecourse material as M/4 AP40. If taken literally there is a swathe of testing required for this material that is not necessarily appropriate for a footpath and means that the requirement is for a very high quality material which ends up being costly and not necessary for a footpath which is getting light pedestrian usage. If council is intending to use this document to enforce quality and standards on completed constructed work then it either needs more detailed specifications on each element so it is clear what is acceptable and what is not or there needs to be a separate QLDC standard construction specification (which there used to be in the Infrastructure Code). Alternatively, as is generally the case at the minute, a separate specification is produced for each development/project. If this is intended then it needs to be clear that QLDC are accepting the specifications submitted with each design and that these take precedence over what might be stated in the COP (the risk to QLDC with this approach is inconsistencies between different specification's being produced by a number of different parties). There also appears to be some crossover with the QLDC District Plan e.g. around parking requirements and typical access way details. Having similar requirements in two separate council documents can lead to confusion and inconsistency and it is preferable that detailed information sits in one document or the other.
Stantec	2b	Roading	n/a	No Change	It is considered that provisions should be made for people for vision disabilities as they are not limited in their access to all areas of the district.	n/a	3.3.11.1	Requirement for tactile pavers	This implies that tactile pavers are required no matter where the footpath is. It would be preferable to define where they must be applied e.g. CBD, commercial shopping areas and where they may be required e.g. in subdivisions with shops/schools where there is likely to be a demand.	A blanket requirement for tactile pavers across the district introduces an ongoing liability to council around maintenance and ongoing cost. It could also result in tactile pavers being installed in locations where they are not appropriate or necessary e.g. at independent crossing locations which don't link to a recognized sealed footpath network.
Stantec	2c	Roading	Yes	Yes	Agree to delete. Covered by another section.	Delete	3.4.4.2	Double Wet Lock Coat	Delete this clause in its entirety	With the amendments made in clause 3.4.4.1 this clause is not necessary and could just cause further confusion
Stantec	2d	Roading	n/a	No Change	Council does not consider duplication within the District Plan to be an issue..	n/a	3.2.8	Vesting	Change this to reference the QLDC District Plan	This requirement is more appropriate to be stated in the District Plan
Stantec	2e	Roading	Yes	Yes	Consistent with District plan requirements and will be amended if District plans changes. Remove line 3 "as per"	Remove line 3 "as per"	3.3.1.3	Parking Requirements	Check cross over with district plan requirements. Also end of first sentence is missing a ending "as per?"	Risk of inconsistency with district plan (and proposed amendments to Part 14 of the district plan)

Stantec	2f	Roading	n/a	No Change	District plans provides provision for on site parking. This clause provides provisions for on street parking.	n/a	3.3.6	Parking Requirements	Check cross over with district plan requirements.	Risk of inconsistency with district plan (and proposed amendments to Part 14 of the district plan)
Stantec	2g	Roading	n/a	Refer 9d in 'September 2017' tab No Change	Deviations may be applied for and allowed if considered appropriate Council considers the CoP appropriate in its present form	n/a	3.3.6	Minimum on-street parking provision of 1 car park per residential unit	Deletion	This is in conflict with Table 3-2. For example, Figure E12 would not be able to be followed in conjunction with Clause 3.3.6. This has implications for good urban design and could adversely impact on housing affordability. We have previously submitted on this matter, and note that QLDC proposes to deal with this by application for exceptions. However, it undermines the purpose of a Code if clauses are in conflict and require separate processes to resolve this for each application.
Stantec	2h	Roading	n/a	No Change	Council understands that asphalt can be laid in winter under certain conditions and the CoP provides the ability to do so by exception with agreement with council	n/a	3.4.1	Sealing Period	Clarify if this applies to chip sealing and asphalt or just chip sealing	Asphalting may be able to be completed during the period 15 May to 15 September if the conditions are appropriate and meet an appropriate asphalting specification
Stantec	2i	Roading	Yes	Yes	Clarifying NAARA requirements	roughness readings are not required on lengths 150m or less e.g. cul-de-sacs, as the shape requirements as per TNZ Specifications are expected to be sufficient to control isolated bumps over this short length. NAASRA is recommended to be undertaken prior to surfacing however it is the finished surface which must satisfy Council Standards. The appropriateness of the NAASRA rating may depend on the road environment, consideration will be taken into account for short, low speed urban roads. It is recognised that survey equipment has operational limits. These include a minimum speed below which the quality of the data collected is compromised. Therefore the Survey Contractor must advise the Client of the minimum speed and other conditions that adversely affect the data quality and advise how the data may be flagged when these situations are encountered. These limitations must be passed to Council along with the completed survey data. Surface Ride for new, rehabilitated or reconstructed pavements The new pavement must have an average dynamic roughness, when measured over a length of 100m, of less than 60 NAASRA counts/km for any three consecutive results and no individual value greater than 70 within the extent of the re-surfacing area unless it can be clearly attributable to a permanent feature such as a bridge joint. Surface Ride for Resurfacing Sites The pre-resurfacing site roughness measure must be obtained from RAMM database – high speed roughness count. Where these measures do not exist, testing must be performed. The average roughness count must be used to benchmark the resurfacing works as described below.	3.4.3.2	NAASRA	Define what the QLDC NAASRA requirements are and where they are to be done	Need clarity on what is acceptable and what is not plus where NAASRA tests are required e.g. it is not appropriate to do them on short, low speed urban streets
Stantec	2j	Roading	Yes	Yes	Agreed	Remove "where required by TA"	3.4.11	Deflection Testing	Confirm if QLDC require it to be done or not? If yes then can it be done at subgrade and back calculated to finish surface as per Austroads?	Be clear if this is testing that QLDC needs or not. Allowing beam testing at subgrade provides opportunity to amend the pavement depth, testing prior to sealing can be too late.
Stantec	2k	Roading	Yes	Yes	Accepted	Chipsealing construction standards shall comply with NZTA specifications P/3 for first coat seals and P/4 for resealing. P/9 replaced with M/10	3.4.12	Surfacing Specification	NZTA P/9 reference should be change to M/10	New NZTA M/10 spec includes for construction requirements and additional testing
Stantec	2l	Roading	Yes	Yes	Referencing has been corrected	(refer to 3.3.11.1 . Tactile pads shall be required at pedestrian kerb crossings in accordance RTS 14 .)	3.4.14.1	Reference to tactile pavers	Seems incomplete and as per above comment needs clarity of where they are required	May not be appropriate to include tactile pavers at every single crossing point
Stantec	2m	Roading	Yes	Yes	A reference to NZS 3114 standard for surface finish tolerances to be referenced here	The surface finish should be determined in relation to the anticipated service conditions in accordance with NZS 3114:1987. Reference to the type and frequency of loading, impact, abrasion, chemical resistance, and other factors such as hygiene, dust prevention, skid resistance and aesthetics where applicable shall be provided in the design.	3.4.14.4	Surface finish, tolerances	"Comply with appropriate design requirements" what does that mean? Very unclear. As per comments above either be clear on a specification or remove this	Unclear on what requirements are
Stantec	2n	Stormwater	n/a	No Change	There is scope for consideration and discussion in these matters in the CoP.	n/a	4.3.5	d) (iii) Easements	Amend wording to clarify and check for consistency across all services.	The wording does not allow for easements containing other services in addition to stormwater. Where the stormwater infrastructure is a surface drain or feature, then offsetting within the easement may be preferable both for access and to avoid remnant land requiring maintenance.
Stantec	2o	Stormwater	Yes	Yes	References corrected	Clause 3.3.1.6 has been removed - reference to table 3.1.6 has been removed. Reference to drawings in Appendix B have been included	4.3.9.6	Traversable culverts	Reference is to table 3.1.6, where is this table? Is reference correct?	Depending on what the table is showing for clear zone requirements is this applicable and or necessary in low speed environments?
Stantec	2p	Wastewater	Yes	Yes	References corrected	The base layout of MHs shall comply with Drawing B1 -5.	5.3.8.4.9	Size of manholes	Last sentence is unfinished "shall comply with?"	
Stantec	2q	Water Supply	n/a	No Change	Current condition considered appropriate. Council provide following statement "When supported by alternative modelling/metering data that has been approved by Council the following minimum water demand figures may be used at the sole discretion of the Council"	n/a	6.3.5.6	Minimum water demand	Delete or amend to current practice	This does not match current practice by QLDC and agreements reached for design water demand on recent developments. The preferred water demand level of service is 1000 litres/dwelling/day with metering (and the capability to charge on a volume basis if required).
Stantec	2r	Stormwater	Yes	Yes	Agreed - n.b. refer to change in 2d (removal of Table 4.1)	Overland flow downstream discharges of the 1% AEP post-development peak flowrate shall be no greater than the 1% AEP pre-development peak flowrate"	Table 4-1	Design requirement "Overland flow downstream discharge no greater than the 1% AEP (100 yr.) predeveloped peak flowrate"	Amend to read "Overland flow downstream discharge for the 1% AEP (100 yr.) post-development peak flowrate no greater than the 1% AEP (100 yr.) predeveloped" peak flowrate"	Current wording would require developments to eliminate all peak flows above the 1% AEP flowrate – presumed to be an unintended outcome, but not practicable to achieve
Stantec	2s	Water Supply	Yes	Yes	Considered appropriate and included in Approved Materials List	Refer to clause 11.1 - Council Approved Materials List.	6.3.6.1	Materials	Amend to allow for pipes less than 100mm to be PE80	PE100 for smaller pipes is not readily available and the same quality can be achieved with PE80 PN 12.5

Stantec	2t	Drawings	n/a	No Change	Drawing B1-1 shows tracer wire incorporated into marking tape.	n/a	Drawing B1-1	Typical Combined Service Trench Detail	This detail does not allow for tracer wire to be incorporated into the warning tape. This type of proprietary product is used extensively so should be included as an approved alternative option.	
Stantec	2u	Andrew I to update Drawing B2-1 and Drawing B2-3		Yes	Agreed	Drawings (B2-1 and B2-3) to be changed or note added to allow for concrete to finish 30mm below surface so that asphalt can be applied when they are positioned in a footpath (or road if really necessary)	Drawing B2-1 and Drawing B2-3	Hydrant and Valve box details	Detail should be changed or note added to allow for concrete to finish 30mm below surface so that asphalt can be applied when they are positioned in a footpath (or road if really necessary)	Provides a neater and more visually pleasing finish in asphalt surfaces. Alternatively a possible solution is to lay the frame on proprietary pre-cast concrete blocks, compact using AP40 up to seal level, and then seal. This prevents the need to keep TM in place to allow concrete to cure if this is completed in a live road situation.
Stantec	2v	Andrew I - Need to amend drawing to standard supplier dimension s/design		Yes	Agreed	Drawing B4-1 to be amended to standard supplier dimensions/design	Drawing B4-1	Inlet and outlet structures	Amend drawing so that dimensions match that of the standard wingwalls produced by Hynds and Humes	The dimensions shown are different to what is typically produced by suppliers. Better to specify something that can actually be supplied
Stantec	2w	Andrew I to check final drawings		Yes	Agreed		Drawing B5-16 and B5-17	Drawing quality	Need higher resolution as too hard to read. Also may need alternative to these as in some locations it may not be possible to fit in a structure of this size	
Stantec	2x	With Andrew I to amend drawing	Yes	Yes	Agree with Proposed Amendment	<p>“Change 1m transition on drop kerb to 600mm. 1m is too wide. Consider taking surface of crossing to top of the drop kerb not bottom as vehicles tend to cut across the drop kerb and you end up with wheels tracking over the grass berm.”</p> <p>Agree: Change transition on drop kerb to 600mm.</p> <p>“Dimension of 3.5m at channel should be 3.5m minimum or 0.5m wider than boundary width (3.5m on its own doesn’t make sense if crossing is 6m wide at boundary)”</p> <p>Confusing proposed amendment. Width at kerb should be changed from ‘minimum 7m’ to ‘width at boundary + 0.5m’</p> <p>Changes to Drawing B5-21 needed.</p>	Drawing B5-21	Vehicle Crossing Residential	<p>Change 1m transition on drop kerb to 600mm. 1m is too wide. Consider taking surface of crossing to top of the drop kerb not bottom as vehicles tend to cut across the drop kerb and you end up with wheels tracking over the grass berm.</p> <p>Dimension of 3.5m at channel should be 3.5m minimum or 0.5m wider than boundary width (3.5m on its own doesn’t make sense if crossing is 6m wide at boundary)</p>	
Stantec	2y	Andrew I - Drawings		Yes	reference to drawing D13 or D14 is not applicable	Require new drawing showing stacked rock head wall at culvert (was shown in part in the old Rural Road vehicle Crossing drawing)	Drawing B5-23	Private Rural Access	Note 4 reference to drawing D13 or D14 is applicable and doesn’t align with proposed amendments elsewhere which talk about traversable headwalls	
Stantec	2z	Andrew I to update drawing		Yes	Agreed	Drawing B5-29 to be updated	Drawing B5-29	Low Retaining Wall	Call up table is unreadable. Timber sizes stated are not all readily available. Need to amend this table to suit what materials are actually available	
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3a	General	n/a	No Change	We have notified interested parties on two separate occasions taking submissions both times and following submissions we provided reasoning for making changes as suggested or not. It is considered the views of submitters has been appropriately taken into consideration and a hearing is not warranted.	n/a	General comment	Process	Ensure there is a hearing, or at a minimum allow an extended period for comments to be made at the Council meeting to adopt the changes.	RCL believes that the changes are significant enough that a hearing of sorts would be justified to ensure submitters are duly satisfied their concerns have been considered by elected officials and / or independently appointed commissioners. The public forum format does not provide sufficient time to allow comments and questions to be made.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3b	General	n/a	No Change	<p>Clear definition of design standards in CoP and reference to NZ standards. No further need for additional infrastructure code</p> <p>In terms of the designs taking precedence over the CoP requirements this is allowed for through accepted deviations through he engineering acceptance process.</p>	n/a	1, 1.1, 1.3	Purpose of the Code of Practice	<p>Clarification on the document either being, or not being, a detailed specification for construction work and clarity on cross over with the QLDC district plan</p>	The COP has increasingly become a mix of guidelines and standards. This can confuse its application. Consideration should be given to splitting the document into two according to those distinctions. It should be noted that there continue to be some areas where there is a lack of recorded standards. This increases the prospect of re-work and can lead to frustration for all parties. For examples more standards in regard to preparation and finishing of asphalt surfaces would be useful.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3c	Roading	n/a	No Change	Exceptions can be applied for in the CoP requirement. QLDC will provide practice notes to provide more understanding of when exemptions will apply.	n/a	3.2.7	Road safety audits	Independent road safety audits should not be required in all situations. The COP should indicate some discretion on this point and it should be made clear in conditions of resource consent whether such audits are necessary.	Where subdivisions are small or very simple there should be occasions where the cost and delays associated with independent road safety audits can be avoided. The combination of designer statements and Council review (at both resource consent and engineering acceptance stage) should often be sufficient assurance for Council.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3d	Roading	n/a	No Change	It is considered that provisions should be made for people for vision disabilities as they are not limited in their access to all areas of the district.	n/a	3.3.11.1	Requirement for tactile pavers	<p>This implies that tactile pavers are required no matter where the footpath is. It would be preferable to define where they must be applied e.g. CBD, commercial shopping areas and where they may be required e.g. in subdivisions with shops/schools where there is likely to be a demand.</p>	<p>A blanket requirement for tactile pavers across the district introduces an ongoing liability to council around maintenance and ongoing cost. It could also result in tactile pavers being installed in locations where they are not appropriate or necessary e.g. at independent crossing locations which don’t link to a recognized sealed footpath network.</p> <p>As has been raised by RCL in the past, it is not clear that there is sufficient benefit in tactile pavers / studs and directional markers to justify their application in quieter suburban areas. The products are costly to install and appear to have a relatively limited lifespan. They can be a hazard in themselves – e.g. for a young child on a skateboard, and for all users if they lift over time. It would appear that few if any other Council’s in New Zealand have required these to be installed in all urban environments.</p> <p>It would be useful for Council to engage some expert advice on the extent to which they are seen as necessary in quieter suburban environments as opposed to alternatives such as using changes in footpath surfaces to demarcate crossing points for the visually impaired.</p>
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3e	Roading	Yes	Yes	Consistent with District plan requirements and will be amended if District plans changes. Remove line 3 “as per”	Remove line 3 “as per”	3.3.1.3	Parking Requirements	Check cross over with district plan requirements.	Risk of inconsistency with district plan (and proposed amendments to Part 14 of the district plan). As that process is ongoing and subject to its own public submission process, it would be simplest to leave these out of the COP.

RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3f	Roading	n/a	No Change	District plans provides provision for on site parking. This clause provides provisions for on street parking.	n/a	3.3.6	Parking Requirements	Check cross over with district plan requirements.	Risk of inconsistency with district plan (and proposed amendments to Part 14 of the district plan). As that process is ongoing and subject to its own public submission process, it would be simplest to leave these out of the COP.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3g	Roading	n/a	No Change	Council understands that asphalt can be laid in winter under certain conditions and the CoP provides the ability to do so by exception with agreement with council	n/a	3.4.1	Sealing Period	Clarify if this applies to chipsealing and asphalt or just chipsealing	Asphalting may be able to be completed during the period 15 May to 15 September if the conditions are appropriate and meet an appropriate asphaltting specification
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3h	Roading	Yes	Yes	Referencing has been corrected	(refer to 3.3.11.1 . Tactile pads shall be required at pedestrian kerb crossings in accordance RTS 14 .)	3.4.14.1	Reference to tactile pavers	Seems incomplete and as per above comment needs clarity of where they are required	May not be appropriate to include tactile pavers at every crossing point.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3i	Roading	Yes	Yes	A reference to NZS 3114 standard for surface finish tolerances to be referenced here	The surface finish should be determined in relation to the anticipated service conditions in accordance with NZS 3114:1987. Reference to the type and frequency of loading, impact, abrasion, chemical resistance, and other factors such as hygiene, dust prevention, skid resistance and aesthetics where applicable shall be provided in the design.	3.4.14.4	Surface finish, tolerances	“Comply with appropriate design requirements” what does that mean? Very unclear. As per comments above either be clear on a specification or remove this	Unclear on what requirements are
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3j	Stormwater	n/a	No Change	There is scope for consideration and discussion in these matters in the CoP.	n/a	4.3.5 Design criteria (iii)	“Easements - The stormwater infrastructure shall be centrally located within the easement. Easements of a minimum width of 3.0m shall be provided for all storm water systems that are to be vested in Council or the system owner where they cross any private land.”	“Easements - The stormwater infrastructure shall be centrally located within the easement. Easements of a minimum width of 3.0m shall be provided for all storm water systems that are to be vested in Council or the system owner where they cross any private land.”	It is unclear as to why a stormwater pipe should be centrally located as opposed to other pipes and cables, so long as it is adequately protected. For larger drains, access tracks are often on one side, meaning centrally locating these is impractical.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3k	Wastewater	Yes	Yes	Agree to change to proposed amendment	Before commencing development a developer shall liaise with the Council’s Asset Performance Team as to whether infrastructure should be upsized to service adjacent future development. If such upgrades are required, agreement shall be reached with QLDC for Council to cover the costs of upgrades.	5.3.3 Future development	“The cost of increased infrastructure to service adjacent future development will be apportioned between the applicant and the Council and agreed in writing with the Council’s Asset Performance Team prior to commencing work.”	Amend to (or similar): “Before commencing development a developer shall liaise with the Council’s Asset Performance Team as to whether infrastructure should be upsized to service adjacent future development. If such upgrades are required, agreement shall be reached with QLDC for Council to cover the costs of upgrades”.	It is not a developer’s responsibility to fund the upsizing of infrastructure to accommodate neighbouring development.
RCL Henley Downs Ltd	3l	Wastewater	Yes	Yes	Agreed to change with minor amendment	The preferred layout/location of pipes within roads, public reserves, and private property may vary and shall be to the requirements of each TA. QLDC’s preference is for all infrastructure to be located within public land. Where this is impractical and that is agreed with Council, access shall be legally secured and it shall be demonstrated how the infrastructure can be readily accessed for routine or emergency maintenance”	5.3.7.1 Pipe location – Amend in clause	“The preferred layout/location of pipes within roads, public reserves, and private property may vary and shall be to the requirements of each TA. Generally locating infrastructure on private land will not be acceptable if that infrastructure is to be vested.”	“The preferred layout/location of pipes within roads, public reserves, and private property may vary and shall be to the requirements of each TA. Generally locating infrastructure on private land will not be acceptable if that infrastructure is to be vested . QLDC’s preference is for all infrastructure to be located within public land. Where this is impractical, access shall be legally secured and it shall be demonstrated how the infrastructure can be readily accessed for routine or emergency maintenance”	The wording as proposed makes it unclear whether there would be sufficient pragmatism applied. In reality, there are occasions where such infrastructure cannot practically be located on public land and this should be acknowledged.
Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4a	Roading	Yes	Yes	Agree with Proposed Amendment	Remove ‘The design shall demonstrate consideration of a sustainable approach to stormwater management rather than kerbed collection, channelling, and disposal, if possible.’	3.3.16.2 Stormwater Design	The design shall demonstrate consideration of a sustainable approach to stormwater management rather than kerbed collection, channelling, and disposal, if possible.	delete paragraph	LID stormwater is covered under section 4
Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4b	Roading	n/a	No Change	These dates have worked effectively for some time. Provided ground temperature is above the minimum required for chip sealing, discretion as to whether to seal or not prior to 15th May or after 15th September is with the developer.	n/a	3.4.1 Introduction	Basecourse preparation and subsequent road sealing shall not occur in the period between 15 May and 15 September each year. Any exemptions shall be at the discretion of Council.	change dates to 1 May and 30 September	constructing a road this close to winter is often hit and miss and the restriction should be a longer period.
Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4c	Stormwater	Yes	Yes	Agree with Proposed Amendment NOTE: Council is in the process of building a comprehensive stormwater models for all catchments to understand where capacity is available and attenuation not required. A one-size fits all solution is not Councils plans for future stormwater management, but a general approach is needed in the interim of the stormwater modelling being completed.	Change 4.3.3 to same text in section 5.3.3: Unless agreed in writing by the Council where further subdivision or development is allowed for within the current district plan upstream of the one under consideration the council shall require infrastructure to be constructed to the upper limits of the subdivision/development to allow for future connections. The assessment of required capacity shall be on the basis of full development to the extent defined in the current district plan. Where infrastructure may service adjacent land then the full development to the extent defined in the current district plan of all the land that may be serviced by the infrastructure shall be included in the capacity calculations. Where the new infrastructure being installed is required by Council to service future development then that infrastructure will be designed and constructed on the basis of full development to the extent defined in the current district plan. The cost of increased infrastructure to service adjacent future development shall be agreed in writing with the Council’s Asset Performance Team prior to commencing work	4.3.3 Future development	Unless agreed in writing by the Council all stormwater infrastructure developed shall cater for existing stormwater (plus additional stormwater due to climate change) generated from sites in the surrounding catchment that feed into the development site	delete proposed wording and retain existing wording. Unless agreed in writing by the Council where further subdivision or development is allowed for within the current district plan upstream of the one under consideration the council shall require infrastructure to be constructed to the upper limits of the subdivision/development to allow for future connections. The assessment of required capacity shall be on the basis of full development to the extent defined in the current district plan. Where infrastructure may service adjacent land then the full development to the extent defined in the current district plan of all the land that may be serviced by the infrastructure shall be included in the capacity calculations. Where the new infrastructure being installed is required by Council to service future development then that infrastructure will be designed and constructed on the basis of full development to the extent defined in the current district plan. The cost of increased infrastructure to service adjacent future development shall be agreed in writing with the Council’s Asset Performance Team prior to commencing	No allowance for increased flows from upstream catchment presumes that all developments have to attenuate stormwater. In some cases it may not be possible to provide onsite attenuation. Council needs to implement proper stormwater catchment management rather than trying to impose a one size fits all approach to stormwater. Each sub catchment within a wider catchment might not be suitable to install LID or attenuation structures and it may be more appropriate to install attenuation near the outfall or in some cases not at all. In addition the use of a network wide approach to attenuation on all sites can in some cases increase flooding downstream whereby the peak of the storm is simply delayed and the effect of flooding are thereby increased. If the attributes of each catchment are not managed properly Council could miss the opportunity to ensure there is a robust well designed reticulated network that will cater for upstream catchment well into the future.

Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4d	Stormwater	Yes	Yes	Agreed	<p>Remove table 4.1 and replace with:</p> <p>Council has 3 primary objectives for stormwater quantity management. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• preventing onsite flooding and frequent overland flows discharging from sites across adjacent properties,• preventing the surcharge of downstream primary drainage network and flooding of downstream properties and• preventing downstream flooding and downstream overland flow path and receiving environment erosion. <p>All sites shall provide onsite primary network drainage capacity for the 5% AEP developed site peak flowrate.</p> <p>When discharging to an existing and unknown primary drainage network the onsite primary drainage network discharge peak flow rate shall be no greater than the 20% AEP pre-developed sites peak flow rate unless otherwise approved by Council.</p> <p>When discharging to new primary drainage networks the onsite primary drainage network downstream discharge peak flow rate shall be no greater than the 5% AEP developed site peak flow rate unless otherwise approved by Council.</p> <p>Overland flow downstream discharges of the 1% AEP post-development peak flowrate shall be no greater than the 1% AEP pre-development peak flowrate”</p>	4.3.5.1 Design Storms Table 4.1	Table 4.1	Delete and use existing table	Overly wordy table, again Council needs to implement proper stormwater catchment management rather than trying to impose a one size fits all approach to stormwater. Each sub catchment within a wider catchment might not be suitable to install LID or attenuation structures and it may be more appropriate to install attenuation near the outfall or in some cases not at all. In addition the use of a network wide approach to attenuation on all sites can in some cases increase flooding downstream whereby the peak of the storm is simply delayed and the effect of flooding are thereby increased. If the attributes of each catchment are not managed properly Council could miss the opportunity to ensure there is a robust well designed reticulated network that will cater for upstream catchment well into the future.
Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4e	Andrew I to update trench detail		Yes	Agreed	Drawing B-1 to be updated	B1 Service Layout	service diagram	Diagram conflict with Chorus requirements by having telecom located over top of power cable. Telecom in past has been located 300mm outside water line. Also there is no allowance for aas.	We can supply a better service trench detail on request
Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4f	Andrew I to update		Yes	Agreed	Drawing B5-28 to be updated	B5-28 Stacked Stone Wall	stack stoned wall	Concrete dish at base of wall should be optional	Concrete dish may not be required if ground slopes away from wall or there is no surface water to collect.
Paterson Pitts Group (Wanaka Branch)	4g	Andrew I to update		Yes	Drawings will be updated no further review.		Diagrams - General Comment	Several diagrams are hard to read and have poor clarity	Reissue diagrams with better clarity for review.	
Southern Land Ltd	5a	Wastewater	n/a	No Change	Council considers 3m easements are required in the vast majority of cases. There may be scope for some exceptions to the rule for high density developments but this will not be noted in the Code of Practice. If the provision of less than 3m easements becomes more commonplace Council will develop a practice note to outline when easements less than 3m may be appropriate	n/a	5.3.7.4 Pipes in private property – Amend in clause	Pipes shall be centrally located within an easement of 3.0m minimum width.	Unless a narrower width easement can be shown to be appropriate	With smaller lots becoming more common place in the district 3.0m can potentially occupy a large proportion of buildable space. If infrastructure is laid at a shallower depth (while still respecting minimum cover) then the zone of influence from adjacent structures will be minimised. the a shallower depth also ensures future access is achievable. Small excavators can access relatively narrow corridors.
Fluent Solutions	6a	Water Supply	n/a	No Change	This is a average daily demand	n/a	6.3.5.6 (a)	(a) Daily consumption of 700 L/person/day (occupancy per residence = 3 people);	(a) Peak daily consumption of 700 L/person/day (occupancy per residence = 3 people);	It is assumed that the 700L/day refers to peak day demand (rather than average day demand) in the absence of any peak day factor given. This should be clarified by adding in the word 'peak'.
Fluent Solutions	6b	Water Supply	Yes	Yes	Agreed	Change Peaking Factor to Peak hour factor in all Section 6.3.5.6	6.3.5.6 (b)	(b) Peaking factor of up to 4.0 (Queenstown), 6.6 (Rest of District);	(b) Peak hour factor of 4.0 (Queenstown), 6.6 (Rest of District);	It is assumed that the peaking factors provided refer to peak hour factors (as opposed to peak day factors). This should be clarified by changing the word 'peaking' to 'peak hour'. Also the words 'up to' are not clear and are unnecessary so should be removed.
Fluent Solutions	6c	Water Supply	Yes	Yes	Agreed	Delete Section 6.3.5.3	6.3.5.6	“Following receipt of validated modelling data the daily consumption has been amended to”	n/a - requires further guidance	It is unclear whether this section completely replaces the peaking factors provided in 6.3.5.3. If it does not completely replace 6.3.5.3 it is unclear when each section should be used. The wording states that 'daily consumption has been amended to...' so this would indicate that the demands outlined in section 6.3.5.6 replace those outlined in section 6.3.5.3. It is recommended that the wording in Section 6.3.5.6 is updated to clarify this. If the peaking factors provided in Section 6.3.5.3 are no longer relevant they should be deleted.